



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,229	07/28/2003	Brad Haerberle	2002P12040US01	6652
7590 Elsa Keller, Legal Assistant Intellectual Property Department SIEMENS CORPORATION 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER CUMARASEGARAN, VERN	
			ART UNIT 3629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/629,229

Applicant(s)

HAEBERLE ET AL.

Examiner

VERN CUMARASEGARAN

Art Unit

3629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruben et al (Patent No. 7,143,048) in view of Pianin (US 2002/0062218).

As to claims 10, 18 and 27 Ruben et al show

providing a web portal (abstract "*internet*") comprising a database (abstract "*computer database*") and storing information about a plurality of building sites in said database (col.5 lines 8-10), said web portal capable of being operatively connected to one or more clients (col.2 lines 16-29 where "...*any internet accessible device*..." can be used by users to access the system);

receiving at said web portal a request from one or more clients for information for a plurality of building sites (abstract "...*property owner can...obtain information for one or more properties that it owns*.");

determining at said web portal a plurality of service activities that are implicated by said request (Table 4);

receiving at said web portal a client request for service information about an individual building site selected by said client (col.12 lines 12-24);

Ruben et al do not expressly show transmitting from said web portal said information implicated by said request such that said information is capable of being displayed on a client display. Pianin shows transmitting from said web portal said information implicated by said request such that said information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.7A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ruben et al and incorporate the feature where the said information is displayed on a client display because it would allow the client to be aware of the of the information that is transmitted.

Ruben et al do not expressly show transmitting from said web portal said service information about an individual building site implicated by said request such that said information is capable of being displayed on a client display. Pianin shows transmitting from said web portal said service information implicated by said request such that said information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.7A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ruben et al and incorporate the feature where the said service information is displayed on a client display because it would allow the client to be aware of the of the service information that is transmitted.

As to claims 11 and 28, Ruben et al show receiving a request about the call status of service activities at said individual building site and transmitting said call status information such that said call status information is capable of being displayed on a client display (col.12 lines 17-20).

As to claims 12, 20 and 29, Ruben et al show receiving a request about the call type of service activities at said individual building site and transmitting said call type

information such that said call type information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.1B).

As to claims 13, 21 and 30, Ruben et al show receiving request about service being performed on different systems at said individual building site and transmitting said information about different systems such that said different system information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.1B).

As to claims 14, 22 and 31, Pianin shows receiving a request about service orders placed for an individual building site and transmitting said information about said service order information such that said service order information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.5A).

As to claims 15, 24 and 32, Pianin shows receiving a request about equipment serviced under a service order and transmitting said equipment information such that said equipment information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.6A).

As to claims 16, 25 and 33, Ruben et al show receiving a request for a technical diagram for a piece of equipment and transmitting said technical diagram such that said technical diagram is capable of being displayed on a client display (col.3, lines 53-67).

As to claims 17, 26 and 34, Pianin shows receiving a request for information about one or more activities logged to a service order and transmitting said logged activity information such that said logged activity information is capable of being displayed on a client display (Fig.7A).

As to claim 19, Ruben et al show web portal capable of transmitting information about the call status of service activities (col.12 lines 15-30).

As to claim 23, Ruben et al show web portal capable of receiving a request from a client for information about a service order at an individual building site and is capable of transmitting information about said service order to said client (col. 12 lines 15-30).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's argument, Rubin et al show a web portal comprising a database (col.17 lines 26-28) for storing service information about a plurality of building sites. Fig.2 clearly shows a single database where web pages for multiple properties will be stored. Through this database, a property owner would be able to access reports related to properties (col.2 lines 45-52) through a communication medium such as the internet which is considered a web portal. Ruben further clarifies that property information can be stored in a central location or at the site of each property (col.17 lines 25-28). Therefore the applicant's arguments that Ruben et al do not show the elements claimed in claims 10, 18, and 27 are not valid and the rejection is maintained.

Applicant's arguments, with respect to 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection for claim 11 is persuasive and has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERN CUMARASEGARAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vc

/John G. Weiss/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629